

## DIARRHENA FESTUCOIDES

M. L. FERNALD

DIARRHENA **festucoides** (Raf.), comb. nov. *Festuca diandra* Michx. Fl. Bor. Am. i. 67, t. 10 (1803), not Moench (1794). *Diarina festucoides* Raf. Med. Repos. hex. 2, v. 352 (1808). *Diarrhena americana* Beauv. Agrost. 142, t. 25, fig. II (1812). *Korycarpus arundinaceus* Zea ex Lagasca, Gen. et Sp. Pl. 4 (1816). *Diarina sylvatica* Raf. Journ. de Phys. lxxxix. 104 (1819). *Corycarpus arundinaceus* Zea ex Spreng. Syst. i. 123 (1825). *Diarrhena diandra* (Michx.) Wood, Class-Bk. ed. 2: 612 (1847); Hitchcock, Trans. Acad. Sci. St. Louis, v. 529 (1891). *Korycarpus diandrus* (Michx.) Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl. 772 (1891).

Although the generic name *Diarrhena* Beauv. Agrost. 142 (1812) is conserved under the International Rules over "Corycarpus ('Korycarpus') Zea in: Acta matrit. (1806)" and "Diarina Raf. in Med. Repos. New York V. (1808) 352," there is considerable doubt whether its conservation was necessary. *Diarina* was not validly published as a genus by Rafinesque in 1808. At that time he merely enumerated in a "Prospectus" many things "which I mean to publish, and only want arrangement and leisure," like much which we all project without proper publication, although careful workers refrain from rushing into print with unconsidered matter. Among the prospective "genusses . . . will be . . . Diarina (festucoides) from the festuca diandra, Michx." Without a single word of differentiation *Diarina* (1808) was not a validly published new genus. As a validly published genus *Diarina* started in Raf. Journ. de Phys. lxxxix. 104 (1819), where it was well described and the name of its species changed from that of 1808: "Type *D. sylvatica*, qui est la *Festuca diandra* de Michaux, etc." In the meantime, however, in 1812, Palisot de Beauvois, without any reference to Rafinesque and his *Diarina festucoides* of 1808, coined the new generic name *Diarrhena*, giving its proper derivation, a detailed generic diagnosis and analytical figures, and he called the one species *D. americana*. Since *Diarina* Raf. had no valid publication as a genus until 1819 and Rafinesque made no reference whatever to the *Diarrhena* of Beauvois (1812) the two must be treated as wholly different generic names (not as mere variations of spelling); and it should be clear that the conservation of *Diarrhena* (1812) over *Diarina* (1819) was unnecessary.

When we consider *Korycarpus* it is at once noteworthy that the best bibliographies are unable to state the page of its publication. Thus Index Kewensis has

KORYCARPUS, Zea, in Act. Matr. (1806); ex Lag. Gen. et Sp. Nov. 4 (1816) = **Diarrhena**, Rafin.

Overlooking for the moment the fact, already discussed, that *Diarrhena* was a genus of Beauvois, not of Rafinesque, we come to the more significant point: that neither Dalla Torre & Harms, Briquet (Règles Internationales) nor Nash (in Britton & Brown, where *Korycarpus* is taken up) could carry the reference to anything more conclusive. The Royal Society Catalogue gives no paper by Zea as late as 1806, though Lagasca cited in his general bibliography "Zea in Actis Academiae medicae matritensis." This series is not enumerated in such later bibliographies as I have been able to examine. Turning again to Lagasca (1816), whose publication of *Korycarpus* is cited in Index Kewensis and by Dalla Torre & Harms, we get a clue. Lagasca's *Genera et Species Plantarum, quae aut novae sunt, aut nondum recte cognoscuntur* has (p. 4) a diagnosis of "KORYCARPUS, Zea" with *K. arundinaceus* "Ze. Ac. Matr. 1806" clearly described as its one species, grown in the Botanic Garden at Madrid from seed received in 1803. The genus and species were put out by Lagasca among "*Genera et Species . . . quae . . . novae sunt*," not as a genus and a species already published; and in the Preface (Lectori) he explicitly states that much of the new material published by him was derived from a manuscript which in 1806 was passed around among the students at Madrid. Until *Korycarpus* Zea can be carried back of Lagasca in 1816, its actual publication by Zea, himself, in 1806 is at least open to doubt. The last publication by Zea given by Colmeiro<sup>1</sup> was in 1805.

Although *Diarina* was not validly published as a genus by Rafinesque in 1808, the SPECIFIC NAME, *festucoides*, was validly published, a substitute for *Festuca diandra* Michx. (1803) which was invalidated by *F. diandra* Moench (1794). By some (for instance, Sprague, in a letter regarding a parallel case) it might be argued that, since *Diarina* Raf. (1808) was not then validly published as a genus, its species would, therefore, be illegitimate. But, following the abandonment years ago of the salutary and constructive "Kew Rule," the species and the specific epithets have now become all-important. Under the more upsetting and complicating rules now in force it makes little or no difference under what genus or what generic name a species was proposed, so long as it was proposed as a species. The species stands by itself, regardless of the nomenclatural or taxonomic status of the genus under which it was first put forward. Thus, *Lysimachia terrestris* (L.)

<sup>1</sup> Colmeiro, *La Botánica y los Botánicos de la Península Hispano-Lusitana*, 191 (1858).

BSP. (of the *Primulaceae*) rests, as to specific name, on Linnaeus's absurd publication of it as a Mistletoe, *Viscum terrestre* L.!

In his classic *Flora Caroliniana* (1788), Thomas Walter was unable to place many NEW SPECIES in proper genera; consequently, when too much puzzled, he repeatedly set up a new genus *Anonymos*. He had 2 genera with the pseudonym *Anonymos* under the *Diandria Monogynia*, 2 under *Triandria Monogynia*, 3 under *Pentandria Monogynia*, 3 under *Pentandria Digynia*, and so on to a total of 28. These various genera were all properly characterized, with diagnoses distinguishing them from related genera and with splendidly detailed descriptions; yet, as *Anonymos*, they had no generic names! The fact that Walter considered them genera is clear: "there are four plants called *Anonymos aquaticus*, two called *A. repens*, and six called *A. caroliniensis*."<sup>1</sup> That these are all species and not to be considered as belonging to one heteromorphic genus was clearly and rightly maintained by Blake: "It seems to the writer . . . that these names should not be rejected on the ground of homonymy, since the genera under which they were published, though unfortunately all provided with the same apology for a name, were properly described and differentiated, and the case is therefore not comparable with that of identical specifics in the same genus."

In this case the species belonged to validly defined but nameless genera; in the case of *Diarina festucoides* the validly published species belonged to a named but invalidly published genus. Walter's new specific names under his 28 nameless genera have been transferred to their proper genera and we now have the universally recognized *Crotalaria rotundifolia* (Walt.) Poir., *Gerardia setacea* (Walt.) J. F. Gmel., *Elytraria caroliniensis* (Walt.) Pers., *Lachnanthes tinctoria* (Walt.) Ell., *Ruellia caroliniensis* (Walt.) Steud., *Lithospermum caroliniense* (Walt.) MacM., *Nymphoides aquaticum* (Walt.) Fern., *Micranthemum umbrosum* (Walt.) Blake, etc., etc.

Many other somewhat parallel cases come to mind; but those cited are sufficient to indicate that, with the abandonment of the "Kew Rule" and the treatment of specific epithets quite apart from the generic, the whole theory of specific nomenclature was changed. Under the existing rules *Diarina*, in 1808, was not a validly published GENUS; but, at the same time, *D. festucoides* was an adequately published SPECIES.

#### GRAY HERBARIUM.

<sup>1</sup> Blake, RHODORA, xvii. 130 (1915), in a paper, "Some Neglected Names in Walter's *Flora Caroliniana*."